

**Single Family Design Guidelines Update  
Neighborhood Preservation Ordinance Update**

**Steering Committee**

**Meeting #12 Notes  
October 22, 2004**

**Steering Committee members:** Chair Dianne Channing, Bruce Bartlett, Stephanie Christoff (attending for Richard Six), Joe Guzzardi, Charmaine Jacobs, Bill Mahan, Alex Pujo (attending for Vadim Hsu).

**Staff:** Bettie Weiss (City Planner), Jaime Limón (Supervising Planner), Heather Baker (Project Planner), Jason Smart (Intern).

- I. Welcome and Introductions**
- II. Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda**  
None.
- III. Administrative Items**
- IV. Project Noticing: Issue Paper F**

Staff presentation was followed by public comment. Public commenters included Sally Sphar and Stephanie Welch. Public comments included:

**Sally Sphar:** Supports Recommendation #7 of Issue Paper F because it would make noticing more consistent. Decision-makers sometimes evaluate projects that have not received neighborhood input due to inconsistent noticing. Require all projects to be noticed at first ABR hearing. The noticing radius should be larger in neighborhoods with large lots. Increased application fees should offset the costs of additional noticing.

**Name Unstated:** Supports Recommendation #9 because on-site posting would allow neighbors outside of a project's noticing radius to learn about a project. Currently, if no building permit is posted, neighbors do not know whether a project is legal. If on-site building permit posting were required, the lack of a posted building permit would give neighbors a legitimate reason to question a project.

**??:** Past president of Riviera Association. Neighbors are currently not satisfied regarding noticing timing.

**Brigitte Forsell:** Noticing is sometimes needed for projects not subject to Design Review. A neighbor's second-story addition has reduced her privacy, and she was not notified prior to project construction.

The Steering Committee next discussed Issue Paper F: Project Noticing, and recognized the possibility of satisfying the intent of noticing recommendations through early neighbor notification, part of the upcoming Good Neighbor Policies discussion. Also, efforts should be made to clarify the public's role in design review. The Steering Committee made the following decisions regarding the paper's recommendations:

**Recommendation #1:** Acknowledge additional direct purposes of noticing:

- Provide additional insight to the ABR and HLC.
- Increase opportunities for mutually agreeable outcomes between interested parties.
- Public's right to know and participate.

**Consensus:** Support.

**Recommendation #2:** Notice all upper-story projects subject to design review.

**6 in Support:** Support notices of new second stories because second-story projects tend to be of great interest to neighbors. Consider not requiring noticing for some small second-story projects that are not large enough to significantly affect neighborhood. Revisit the topic during triggers discussion.

**1 Opposed:** Alex Pujo opposed because some second-story projects may be so insignificant that noticing them would infringe upon applicants' property rights.

**Recommendation #3:** Maintain current practice of no formal building permit noticing, but explore feasibility of posting pending building permits on the internet.

**Consensus:** Oppose because Staff may be unable to provide the public with additional project information and because online posting could give the public unrealistic expectations of affecting building permit outcomes. Neighbors can verify the legality of projects by calling or visiting the City's Community Development Department office.

**Recommendation #4:** Standardize to 300 ft. noticing radius, if consistent with State law.

**Consensus:** Tentatively support in order to make noticing more consistent. The Committee requests Staff to study the effects of different noticing radii in different residential zones. Noticing radii should be increased in hillside areas. On-site noticing should be used in conjunction with increased noticing radii.

**Recommendation #5:** Explore feasibility of reconfiguring permit plan system to better accommodate interested parties and neighborhood associations.

**Consensus:** Support in order to formalize City noticing practices.

**Recommendation #6:** Explore including tenants in noticing.

**Consensus:** Table issue until Staff has obtained information regarding how Goleta and/or other jurisdictions notify both property owners and tenants.

**Recommendation #7:** Require first ABR hearing to be noticed for all projects.

**Consensus:** Support because noticing should occur as early as possible in order to maximum the likelihood of mutually beneficial project outcomes for interested parties.

**Recommendation #8:** Require larger project substitutions to be noticed.

**Consensus:** Support the following changes to the City's administrative practices regarding project plan substitutions because project changes may significantly impact neighbors and because it is fair for applicants to pay for noticing project changes:

*"If project plan substitutions contain project changes that the Community Development Director determines may constitute a substantial change in a project's size, bulk or scale that could potentially affect neighborhood compatibility*

*more so than the previously noticed plan (including an increase in height or square footage), the Community Development Director may require the project to be re-noticed. The Community Development Director shall require an additional noticing fee to be paid by the applicant in these cases.”*

**Recommendation #9:** Require on-site noticing for noticed projects.

**Consensus:** Support, with discussion of details later. Tentatively support the following details:

- Timing and length of notice period: Place at first 10-day notice period for 10 days.
- Location: Minimum of one notice posted at each visible street frontage.
- Size and type: 8 ½ X 11”

**Recommendation #10:** Explore feasibility of e-mail courtesy noticing.

**Consensus:** Oppose because of the following reasons:

- Additional burden on Staff would result.
- Spam and viruses may affect City computers.
- The public may develop unrealistic expectations regarding the ability to change a project’s outcome.

## **V. Review Upcoming Schedule**

## **VI. Adjourn**